

IN THE CLAIMS:

Add the following claims:

110. A postal envelope system as defined in claim 91, wherein said means and said flap are both relatively narrow as compared to the distance between said upper and lower ends.

D3
111. A postal envelope system as defined in claim 92, in which said tear strip is relatively narrow as compared to the distance between said upper and lower ends.

REMARKS

Claims 82 to 111 are in this case.

The amendments to the specification and the proposal to amend the drawings are in compliance with the Examiner's requirements.

The Examiner has rejected claims as anticipated by Fabel, and as obvious over Fabel in view of four facts set forth in the Examiner's paragraph 7.1.1. These facts are sometimes hereafter referred to as the "7.1.1 facts."

There are a number of elements of the claims that are neither shown nor suggested by Fabel or by the 7.1.1 facts. Set forth below are certain excerpts from claims 82 to 109 that are not in either Fabel or the 7.1.1 facts.

CLAIM 82

Claim 82 has the following limitations not present in Fabel or in the 7.1.1 facts:

each of said addresses on said outgoing and said reply envelopes being vertically below a corresponding address on said originating sheet when the envelopes are held in a horizontal plane,

a coating contiguous to said reply envelope for applying said addresses on said reply envelope when said addresses are printed on said originating sheet.